
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

RAJU MEGANATHAN, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

SIGNAL INTERNATIONAL L.L.C.,
et al.,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:13-CV-497

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

Pending before the court is the “Motion Pursuant to Federal Rule 72 and LR 72(b) for Reconsideration of Magistrate’s Decision” (Doc. No. 46) filed by Defendants Signal International, L.L.C., Signal International, Inc., Signal International Texas, G.P., Signal International Texas, L.P. (collectively, “Signal”). In its motion, Signal appeals the magistrate judge’s “Order” (Doc. No. 44) denying its “Motion for Stay Pendente Lite and for Transfer Pursuant to First Filed Rule.” (Doc. No. 17).

A motion to transfer venue is a non-dispositive motion. ColorQuick, L.L.C. v. Vistaprint Ltd., 6:09-cv-323, 2010 WL 5136050, at *3 (E.D. Tex. July 22, 2010) (Davis, D.J.) (citing Gen. Order 10–1 (amending Local Civil Rule CV–7(a)(2) to explicitly identify motions to transfer venue as non-dispositive motions); Gen. Order 10–2 (declaring “[t]he public notice and comment period for General Order 10–1 has expired, and the rules contained therein remain in effect as of the date of that order”)); see also Gen. Order 11-3 (March 15, 2011) (“Non-dispositive motions include, among others, motions to transfer venue”). The district judge must consider timely objections to a magistrate judge’s order responding to a non-dispositive motion, and modify or set aside any part of the order that is clearly erroneous or is contrary to law. FED. R. CIV. P. 72.

After considering the arguments of the parties and the applicable law, the court finds that the magistrate judge's order is neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law. Accordingly, Signal's "Motion Pursuant to Federal Rule 72 and LR 72(b) for Reconsideration of Magistrate's Decision" (Doc. No. 46) is **DENIED**.

SIGNED at Beaumont, Texas, this 20th day of October, 2014.



MARCIA A. CRONE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE